

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are now pending in the application. Claim 7 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8-13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0026248, hereinafter Goren) in view of Dunn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,209, hereinafter Dunn), and further in view of Long (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0039195, hereinafter Long). Claims 4, 6 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn and Long, and further in view of Tian, and further in view of Livingston (U.S. Pat. No. 6,621,590, hereinafter Livingston). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant encloses herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 and associated evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 stating that the present invention was at least conceived in this country prior to August 7, 2001, the filing date of Long (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0039195), and thereafter that efforts were diligently made to reduce the invention to practice. Therefore, Long is not a valid prior art reference to the presently pending claims and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of the claims.

Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn and Long, and further in view of Tian. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn and Long,

and further in view of Tian, and further in view of Livingston, and further in view of Parikh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,801,697). Claims 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn and Long, and further in view of Bernheiser (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,747). These rejections are all rendered moot in view of the § 1.131 affidavit regarding Long.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 8, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps